1	RAND L. STEPHENS, SBN 117229 LAW OFFICES OF RAND L. STEPHENS 1155C Arnold Dr. #278 Martinez, CA 94553-4104 (510)232-9335 Fax: (510)232-4633 Email: rand@randslaw.com RICHARD N. KOSS, SBN 251351 570 El Camino Real, Ste. 150-340 Redwood City, CA 94063-1262 (650)722-7046 Fax: (650)592-3871 E-mail: richard@rkosslaw.com	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff: C. ROBERT PETTIT, M.D.	
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	C. ROBERT PETTIT, M.D.,	Case No.: C 07 3358 JSW
14	Plaintiff,	PROPOSED ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
15	vs.	
16	CONTRA COSTA MEDICAL SERVICES REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER and	
17	DOES ONE THROUGH TWENTY,	
18	Inclusive	
19	Defendants	
20	Defendant Contra Costa County moved for summary judgment or in the alternative	
21	partial summary judgment. Plaintiff C. Robert Pettit, M.D. responded to Defendant's motion.	
22	Dr. Pettit alleges six causes of action: (1) violation of whistle-blower statute (Cal. Labor	
23	Code §1102.5); (2) breach of contract; (3) violation of public policy (pretext in hiring) (Cal.	
24	Labor Code §1102.5); (4) breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing; (5) wrongful	
25	termination (Cal. Gov't. Code §12940, et seq., Cal. Civ. Code §3287); and (6) age discrimination	
26	(asserted under both federal and California law). The age discrimination cause of action is the	
27	only cause of action asserted under federal law; all other causes of action are brought solely	
28	under California law. However, Plaintiff will move to amend the pleading and add a federal	

1 cause of action under the Whistleblowing Protection Act (5 USCS §2302) to the whistleblowing 2 cause of action. 3 Plaintiff dismisses his cause of action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair 4 dealing, as this claim duplicates the breach of contract claim and is therefore superfluous. Guz v. 5 Bechtel Nat., Inc., 24 Cal. 4th 317, 351-52 (2000). Plaintiff has proven triable issues of fact on all other causes of action. The McDonnell 6 7 Douglas burden shifting test does not provide that a discriminatory motive must be proven, only 8 that "some other circumstance suggests discriminatory motive." *Id.*, at 355. Plaintiff has met 9 that burden. 10 Defendant's motion for summary judgment is granted on the cause of action for breach of 11 the covenant of good faith and fair dealing. Defendant's motion for summary judgment is denied for all other causes of action. The court declines Defendant's request to remand the remaining 12 13 causes of action to state court. 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 15 16 17 Dated: 18 19 20 JEFFREY S. WHITE 21 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28